

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the current application are respectfully requested. No new matter has been added.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-2, 5-7, 9, 11, 13-18, and 20 are rejected as allegedly being unpatentable over King et al. (Patent Number 5,745,904; “King”), in view of Benson (Publication Number 200410225675 A1; “Benson”), and in further view of Lettich et al. (Publication No. 2002/0049622; “Lettich”). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the data objects buffered in the data buffer have a logical key corresponding to a database of the data object, a description of an aggregation level, and a description of a selection condition, and that the business reporting tool and the business planning tool request data from the data buffer having a specified aggregation level and a specified selection condition (for support, see, inter alia, specification par. 27, 29, 36). Claims 9 and 14 were similarly amended.

None of the cited references, whether considered singly or in combination disclose the subject matter of claim 1. Moreover, the skilled artisan would not have been motivated to combine King, which relates to a computer database system that allows local buffering of changes to a database, with Benson, which relates to techniques for synchronizing metadirectories, with Lettich which relates to a system which provides shipping and logistics services to the chemical industry, as all of these references relate to disparate industries having disparate problems to be solved.

Even if such references were combined, they fail to suggest the buffering of data objects as recited in the claims as well as the types of requests made from the recited tools. The mere mention of the possibility of using an multidimensional database in Lettich does not teach the subject matter of the claim 1, and in particular, the techniques for requesting data by the tools, to a skilled person. In addition, Lettich simply describes in passing that OLAP may be utilized, and separately states that reports can be generated. Lettich fails to disclose the tools as recited in claim 1.

Accordingly, claims 1, 9, 14, and their respective dependent claims should be allowable.

New claim 21 recites an integrated business planning and reporting platform embodied in computer-readable media, the platform comprising: a database storing data buffer configured to store one or more data objects, wherein the at least one data object includes data read from the database; a business reporting tool which displays reports and performs online analytical processing business reporting operations based on one or more data objects accessed from the data buffer; a business planning tool, visually integrated with the reporting tool, which performs online analytical processing business planning operations based on the one or more data objects accessed from the data buffer; and a delta buffer configured to store a delta record characterizing a difference between the data objects and a modified version of the data objects, the modified version being a result of a change made to the one or more data objects by the reporting tool, the planning tool, or both, the business planning tool being operable to receive-user generated input modifying the data objects accessed from the data buffer thereby resulting in a

modification of a report being concurrently displayed by the reporting tool (for support, see, inter alia, specification par. 28).

None of the references disclose or otherwise suggest the subject matter of claim 21, whether considered singly or in combination. In particular, King, which describes tools accessing databases, does not describe a reporting tool nor a business planning tool as recited in claim 21. Similarly, Lettich describes in passing that OLAP could be utilized, however, it fails to disclose reporting tools and business tools. As a result, the cited references also fail to suggest that an output of the reporting tool can be visually integrated with that of the reporting tool.

Accordingly, claim 21 should also be allowable.

Concluding Comments

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed in this paper. However, failure to address a specific rejection, issue or comment, does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above are not intended to be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

On the basis of the foregoing amendments, Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. If there are any questions regarding these

amendments and remarks, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at the telephone number provided below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the additional claim fee, one-month extension fee and any additional fees that may be due, or credit any overpayment of same, to Deposit Account No. 50-0311, Reference No. 34874-022.

Respectfully submitted,

/ck3/

Date: November 9, 2007

Carl A. Kukkonen, III
Reg. No.: 42,773

Mintz, Levin, Cohn, Ferris, Glovsky and Popeo, P.C.
9255 Towne Centre Drive, Suite 600
San Diego, CA 92121
Customer No. 64280
Tel.: 858/320-3000
Fax: 858/320-3001

4187530v.1